

REMARKS

This application contains claims 10-23. Claims 10 and 17 are hereby amended. No new matter has been introduced. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks Examiner Nguyen for the courtesy of a telephone interview with Applicant's representative, Daniel Kligler (Reg. No. 41,120), held August 17, 2010. In the interview, Applicant's representative presented a proposed amendment to claim 10, which recites that the angular velocity sensors are fixed to the antenna and measure the antenna rotation about respective axes of a coordinate system that is fixed with respect to the antenna. The Examiner indicated that the proposed amendment appears to overcome the present rejections. Applicant has therefore amended the independent claims as agreed in the interview.

In the Official Action, independent claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, for both lack of enablement and indefiniteness. The Examiner took the position that the phrase "angular velocity sensors... indicating a measure of a rotation of the antenna about respective axes irrespective of motion of the vehicle" is indefinite and is not enabled in the specification. (In the Office Action the Examiner refers to claim 1. This reference seems to be a mistake, since claim 1 was canceled in a previous amendment, and in any case did not include the phrase in question.) While disagreeing with the grounds of rejection, Applicant has amended claim 10, as agreed in the interview, in order to overcome the rejection and put the application in condition for allowance.

Instead of the phrase that was rejected by the Examiner, amended claim 10 now recites that the angular velocity sensors are fixed to the antenna and generate outputs indicating a measure of a rotation of the antenna

about respective axes of a coordinate system that is fixed with respect to the antenna. This feature is supported literally in the specification, for example in paragraphs [0015], [0026] and [0033]. (The paragraph numbers refer to the published version of the application, US 2006/0273958.)

All the claims in the application were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Aoshima et al. (U.S. Patent 6,052,084, hereinafter Aoshima) in view of Kuroda et al. (U.S. Patent 4,586,050, hereinafter Kuroda). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The cited art does not teach or suggest the features of amended claim 10. Both Aoshima and Kuroda recite sensors that are fixed not to the antenna, but rather to the platform that carries the antenna (i.e., the sensors are fixed to the platform with respect to which the antenna is rotated - a vehicle in Aoshima and a floating oil rig in Kuroda). See, for example, Fig. 1 and column 2, lines 48-49, and column 3, lines 33-35, in Aoshima, and column 2, lines 26-29, column 2, lines 65-66, column 3, lines 22-25, and column 4, lines 40-43 in Kuroda. In both cited references, the gyro sensors are mounted on the platform with respect to which the antenna is rotated and not on the antenna itself.

In other words, the cited references teach gyro sensors that are fixed to the platform and measure the motion of the platform. In contrast, the angular velocity sensors recited in amended claim 10 are fixed to the antenna, and measure the motion of the antenna regardless of motion of the vehicle. In summary, the cited references do not teach or suggest the use of angular velocity sensors that are fixed to the antenna, and certainly not angular velocity sensors that generate outputs indicating a measure of a rotation of the antenna

about respective axes of a coordinate system that is fixed with respect to the antenna, as recited in amended claim 10. Therefore, amended claim 10 is patentable over the cited art.

Independent claim 17 recites a method for controlling an antenna, which operates on similar principles to the system of claim 10. Applicant has amended claim 17 in like manner to the amendment of claim 10. Claim 17 is therefore patentable over the cited art for the reasons explained above.

All the dependent claims in this application depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 10 or 17. In view of the patentability of independent claims 10 and 17, the dependent claims in this application are patentable over the cited art, as well.

Applicant believes the amendments and remarks presented hereinabove to be fully responsive to all of the grounds of rejection that were raised by the Examiner. In view of these amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that all of the claims in the present application are in order for allowance. Notice to this effect is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,
/DANIEL KLIGLER/
Daniel Kligler, Reg. No. 41,120
D. Kligler IP Services Ltd.
P.O. Box 33111, Tel Aviv 61330
Tel. 011-972-54-6968891
Fax 011-972-3-6935321
daniel@dkpat.co.il